Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed on August 24, 2004. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 16, and 19 have been editorially amended. All of these amendments are to correct typographical errors or other informalities; none of the amendments limit the scope of the claims. Claims 1-21 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. Specification

The abstract stands objected to as containing more than 150 words. The abstract has been amended to reduce the number of words to less than 150. Reconsideration and removal of the objection are therefore respectfully requested.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, and 19 stand objected to based on informalities. Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, and 19 have been amended to address the informalities. The amendments to not alter the scope of the pending claims. Reconsideration and removal of the objections are respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,134,609, in view of Fox, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,700. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 1 recites:

- determining an identity of the requested processing component, including an identity of a class ID from a request to activate a component initiated by a calling component;
- obtaining configuration data for the requested component, the configuration data comprises an indication of public-private status for the requested component;

8

- if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a public component, activating an instance of the requested component;
- if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, performing the following:
  - determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member; and
  - if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component.

The accuracy of the characterization of Jones provided in the rejection is not conceded. However, the rejection concedes that Jones fails to disclose a private component. The rejection cites column 4, lines 17-22 of Fox as disclosing that if a method and data of an object are private, the method and data of that object can be accessed only by the other methods of that same object and not by methods of other objects or other software programs. This characterization of Fox is respectfully traversed.

Fox discloses that a developer can define objects during program design in which all or some of the data variables and all or some of the related methods are considered "private" for use only by the object itself. Fox, col. 4, ll. 19-25. In other words, Fox discloses the ability to define variables as public or private during programming and prior to compilation of the code for an object. See Fox, col. 4, ll. 27-30. If an attempt is made in the code to directly access private variables, an error occurs during compilation, stopping the program from being run. Fox, col. 4, ll. 30-34.

In contrast to the ability to define variables in source code as private as disclosed by Fox, claim 1 recites a method of activating a requested processing component. Fox fails to disclose or suggest that if configuration data indicates that a requested component is a private component, determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member, and if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component, as recited by claim 1.

9

For at least these reasons, neither Jones nor Fox, alone or in combination, discloses the method recited by claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 7 recites a computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 7 recites, among other limitations, that if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member, and if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component. For at least reasons similar to those provide above with respect to claim 1, neither Jones nor Fox discloses or suggests a method as recited by claim 7. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 7 are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 8 recites a computer program data product readable by a computing system and encoding instructions for a method for activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 8 recites, among other limitations, that if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member, and if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component. For at least reasons similar to those provide above with respect to claim 1, neither Jones nor Fox discloses or suggests a computer program data product as recited by claim 8. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 8, as well as claims 9-15 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 16 recites a computing system for activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications. Claim 16 recites, among other limitations, a permit object activation module for determining whether an instance of the requested component may be activated, the permit object activation module using a value of a public/private property to determine whether the request component may be activated. For at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 1, neither Jones nor Fox discloses or suggests a permit object activation module for

10

determining whether an instance of the requested component may be activated, the permit object activation module using a value of a public/private property to determine whether the request component may be activated, as recited by claim 16. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 16, as well as claims 17-21 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

IV.   Conclusion

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this matter, please call the undersigned at 612.332.5300.

Respectfully submitted,
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612.332.5300

Date: __Nov. 24___ , 2004

Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK

11